CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
FULLERTON

Guide to Effective Staff Performance Evaluations

HRS Human Resource Services-Operations

*"The research is clear. The outcome is consistent. We know with certainty that the most powerful leadership tool for improving productivity and increasing employee satisfaction is regular, frequent, and balanced performance feedback. Emerging data shows that feedback is a key driver for continuous learning, creativity, and, ultimately, customer satisfaction."**

The contributions made by each of us are key to the success of our University. Performance evaluations play a significant role in integrating organizational assessment, planning, and goal setting with individual performance planning, goal setting, and measurement. They also provide a framework for professional development and recognition of the quality of work provided by individuals and their commitment to mission and goals of the University.

Successful performance management is an ongoing and continuous process involving interactive and open communication between the evaluator and the staff member whose performance is being evaluated. Ideally, the performance management process continues throughout the year with regular communication and feedback between the evaluator and staff member. Doing so encourages a higher level of performance and ensures compliance with collective bargaining agreement requirements and campus practices concerning preparation and delivery of written performance evaluations at regular intervals.

Written performance evaluations serve as a resource for documenting these communications and as a reference document to guide future performance as the year progresses. In as such, performance evaluations provide:

- A regular focal point to measure individual progress
- A mechanism for developing and communicating new goals for the upcoming year
- An opportunity to motivate achievement of increased performance
- A framework for communication regarding expectations, performance, and personal development
- An opportunity for staff to share their own performance and goals for the upcoming year and suggest how they could make improvements through their own work

- Written recognition of work performance that may also be used as the basis for performance-based salary increases and/or advancement opportunities when these are available.

A well written performance evaluation clearly communicates performance standards and expectations to the staff member. A well written performance evaluation also functions as a written framework for recognizing good performance and providing constructive guidance for future achievements. A well written performance evaluation documents what the staff member has accomplished and provides tangible examples of how performance could be improved. Finally, well written performance evaluation reflects how the staff member has contributed to the accomplishment of personal and organizational goals.

Although evaluations should address performance as it occurs, there are established minimum intervals in which written evaluations must be prepared and delivered.

Permanent staff members - Receive a minimum of one Performance Evaluation annually.

Temporary Fiscal Year Renewal and Long Term Temporary staff members - Receive a minimum of one Performance Evaluation annually.

Probationary staff members - There are a variety of collective bargaining requirements regarding the frequency of Performance Evaluations for probationary staff members. Referencing the appropriate collective bargaining agreement or contacting Human Resources will provide specifics regarding these requirements. When there is no language in the agreement regarding the frequency of probationary Performance Evaluations, the campus practice is to conduct at least one Evaluation during the probationary period.

This guide is intended to be a resource for individuals responsible for evaluating staff job performance. It may also assist staff who are being evaluated to better understand the staff evaluation process. This guide does not apply to the evaluation of faculty or management positions.

**Book by Tom Coens and Mary Jenkins*

TIPS FOR PREPARING PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

During the year and prior to the performance evaluation meeting, the evaluator should:

Communicate
Document
Review
Solicit

Communicate - Regular communication, coaching, and feedback during the year will reduce or eliminate tension and anxiety about the Performance Evaluation on the part of both the evaluator and the staff member. Positive and negative feedback is much more effective when given in a timely manner. A staff member should not be surprised by any of the information contained in the Performance Evaluation since the evaluator should have previously discussed all performance related issues throughout the year.

Document - During the review period, the evaluator should collect and record significant, job-related incidents that pertain to each performance criterion. This provides a factual basis for performance ratings and overall assessment. Documentation gathered should be accurate and specific, both positive and negative, including the context in which they occurred as well as the date they occurred. It is important to distinguish between fact and opinion in documenting performance. Documentation should focus on facts. Facts are events, behaviors, or results. Facts are described through things that are known. (What was seen? What was heard?) Examples of documentation could include copies of a staff member's work product, notes of discussions between the staff member and evaluator, copies of communications between the staff member and the evaluator, or recorded observations of the evaluator.

Review - Periodic review of the position description and revision, as necessary, eliminates misunderstandings between the evaluator and the staff member regarding job responsibilities and expectations. Position requirements and assignments should be clear to the staff member, and they may change. It is important that these changes are documented on the Position Description. Before writing a staff member's Performance Evaluation, the evaluator must review the Position Description and confirm that it is accurate. If the position description is not accurate, a revised position description must be submitted to Human Resources within 30 days.

Solicit – To help reduce anxiety and create a positive environment for enhancing performance, the evaluator should ask the staff member to submit written input regarding his/her performance, including accomplishments relating to goals from the previous year and possible goals for the upcoming year. The staff member should be assured they are not being asked to write their own performance evaluation, rather they are simply being asked to provide their perspective. Staff members may provide this input via a Pre-Performance Evaluation Worksheet found on eForm or by another mechanism such as a memorandum. Evaluators should let the staff member know that this input is not mandatory and that lack of written input from a staff member will not negatively impact the staff member's performance evaluation ratings.

The next step is meeting with the staff member for an informal discussion regarding the past year's performance and goals for the upcoming year. A HEERA designated administrator or bargaining unit supervisor may conduct this pre-evaluation meeting. The evaluator or supervisor should not have prepared a written Evaluation in advance of this informal discussion and written input received from the staff member should be utilized as a starting point for the discussion. If the staff member has chosen to not provide input, the evaluator or supervisor may use the Pre-Performance Evaluation Worksheet as a starting point for the discussion.

The evaluator or supervisor should focus on clarifying how the staff member views his/her performance and getting the staff member's input regarding how his/her performance could be further enhanced. The evaluator or supervisor should be open and receptive to ideas and suggestions provided by the staff member, and should actively listen to determine how he/she can provide support for the staff member's performance during the upcoming evaluation period.

In addition to clarifying the staff member's pre-performance input, the evaluator and staff member should review the performance evaluation criteria to ensure mutual understanding of performance expectations. The discussion between the evaluator and staff member should clearly define the specifics related to the performance criteria and the staff member's job responsibilities. Finally, during this discussion, a review of the staff member's position description will ensure it is accurate and mutually understood.

Based on this input, the evaluator will be able to prepare a “draft” performance evaluation, which is required for Bargaining Units 2,4,5,7,& 9, and strongly recommended for Units 1, 6, and 8.

Common Rating Problems

The performance evaluation rating process has some common pitfalls, to include:

Lack of Clarity and Agreement in Standards - The Position Description and the performance criteria should be available and clearly understood by the evaluator and the staff member. Periodic review and discussion will overcome this issue.

Insufficient Evidence - It is nearly impossible to recall an entire year’s worth of performance in several criteria for several staff members from memory alone. Recording significant and critical incidents of both a positive and negative nature will provide the information needed to communicate the rationale for the rating(s).

Excessive Strictness or Leniency - The tendency to be optimistic or pessimistic may influence the incidents documented and the emphasis placed on them. Some evaluators say that “no one is perfect” and deliver very tough, strict Evaluations. Others fear offending staff members or feel that high ratings will motivate the staff member and are overly positive in the review. A wide variety of documented incidents across all the criteria should provide an excellent base for ratings that are specific for each criterion.

Halo Effect - It is easy to allow the stellar performance in one or more criteria to influence the ratings in the other criteria. Evaluators should review each criterion on its own merit and have documentation to support each rating, to avoid this rating error.

Horns Effect - The opposite of Halo Effect, where an evaluator allow poor performance in one or more criteria to influence the ratings in the other criteria.

Central Tendency - Playing it safe and giving everyone a middle of the road rating also does everyone a disservice. Careful reading and consistent application of the criteria language and comparison to documented behaviors will help in giving objective ratings.

Similar to Me - Evaluators may tend to give staff members who are perceived to be like them higher ratings than those who are not. Diversity factors come into play, such as age, sex, culture, and educational level. Evaluators should be aware of this possibility and focus on actual job performance and visible results.

Recent Effect - The performance evaluation rating should reflect the entire review period. A recent positive or negative event should not color the entire rating.

TIPS FOR DISCUSSING PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

Being involved in performance discussions can be both a nervous and rewarding experience. Evaluators will want to provide encouragement and guidance, as well as clarify expectations for the coming year. It is important to be clear about the purpose of the discussion before beginning the conversation. The following tips may helpful regardless of your role in the discussion.

Utilizing the written form as a guide, the evaluator should discuss areas in which the staff member has performed well along with areas in which improved performance may be possible. It is important to ensure the staff member takes ownership of his/her performance and is committed to goals for the coming year. Similarly, the evaluator should commit to the support he/she will provide to ensure the staff member's success. As with the previous Pre-Performance Evaluation informal discussion, the focus of the discussion should be on the evaluator and staff member working in partnership to achieve the common goal of enhanced staff performance.

Be Prepared - It is important to schedule the time and place of the discussion well in advance of the discussion so that you will have ample opportunity to prepare. It is especially important to schedule adequate meeting time, to allow ample time for discussion without interruption. It is also important to conduct the discussions in a private setting where you will be able to talk openly without concern of being overheard. It is important to think about what you wish to discuss in advance so your discussion will stay on track. You may want to make a few notes before your meeting.

Be Open and Receptive - One of the goals of performance evaluation is to align goals and expectations with actual performance. For this to occur, it is important for the evaluator to communicate what is expected of the staff member. This includes how accomplishments will be measured (i.e. quality, quantity, timeliness) and what factors have influence performance (i.e. unexpected staffing decreases, new regulatory requirements). The annual evaluation is a global discussion of overall performance as it was evidenced during the year. Although there may have been specific areas of concern, generally conduct related issues such as a failure to follow a workplace rule (whether written or unwritten) or tardiness and/or absenteeism would been dealt with in the form of an individual communication that specifically addresses that particular issue.

Demonstrate Respect and Dignity - It is important to demonstrate respect and dignity through maintaining confidentiality, by not sharing what you have discussed with others who do not have a need to know. Listening carefully, being careful to be perceptive beyond what is said, and seeking clarification, will demonstrate your interest in understanding what the other person is saying and how it can help you in your role as an evaluator. Avoiding argument and recognize individual perceptions and opinions will likely lead to a more productive discussion. It may be helpful to recognize the mutual goals of improving performance and focusing on opportunities for professional development. Be careful not to concentrate too closely on minor issues or to become to highly critical on any particular item unless that item is essential to the successful performance of the job.

At the conclusion of the Performance Evaluation discussion, the staff member should be asked to sign the form. After giving the staff member a copy of the signed form, the original should be sent to Human Resources for the staff member's personnel file.

Challenging Situations

If a staff member declines to sign the form, the evaluator should inform the staff member that his/her signature does not indicate agreement with the content of the Performance Evaluation, only that he/she has received the Evaluation. If the staff member still refuses to sign, the evaluator should indicate this to be the case in the section designated for the staff member's signature by writing "Staff member reviewed the Evaluation and refused to sign". This statement should be initialed and dated by the evaluator.

By soliciting staff member input before the Evaluation is developed, the evaluator can mitigate the possibility that the staff member will provide additional performance information during the discussion that suggest the performance evaluation ratings should be modified. However, the potential for this situation to occur always exists.

In this situation it is important to determine whether or not the information provided by the staff member does indeed require any of the performance evaluation ratings be changed. This is best done after listening to the staff member and fully considering his/her input. If necessary, the evaluator should take additional time to consider the new information provided. The staff member should *not* sign the Performance Evaluation document while the evaluator reviews the new information and makes a determination regarding whether or not to change a rating. The evaluator should consult Human Resources if he/she determines changing a performance evaluation rating is appropriate before making the change or discussing his/her intent to do so with the staff member.

If a staff member strongly disagrees with the evaluation ratings, but offers no compelling, specific, or new information that supports changes to the evaluation ratings, the evaluator should remain calm and focus on the documented evidence that resulted in the ratings given. The evaluator should offer specific examples of the staff member's performance that illustrate that the rating given is consistent with the appropriate performance evaluation language written on the form. If the evaluator and the staff member continue to disagree and the discussion becomes heated or non-productive, the evaluator should suggest they take a break and get together again within the next few days.

All of the collective bargaining agreements that provide for staff Performance Evaluations also include provisions for a staff member to submit a rebuttal to the Evaluation. When the staff member writes a rebuttal to a Performance Evaluation, a copy should be forwarded to HR for inclusion in the personnel file.

Giving Feedback

No matter how much preparation, documentation, and communication the evaluator has done, the Performance Evaluation discussion can be stressful. The staff member usually hears and remembers the negative statements, even if the overall rating is excellent. Thoughtful preparation for the conversation will help avoid dissatisfaction. Here are some guidelines to giving feedback that will help during the entire review period and especially during this discussion.

- Be honest.
- Demonstrate respect for the person without glossing over negative feedback or being vague.
- Prepare, even practice, difficult statements ahead of time.

- Make comments descriptive, not evaluative. For example, "I've observed you several times working with students. You do not always take the time to understand and fully answer their questions," rather than, "You don't treat students very well."
- Describe behaviors and actions, not total impressions. *Be specific.* Rather than, "I'm not very happy with the quality of your work" say, "The number of errors in your data entry has been running at ten per week."
- Make specific suggestions, not general ones. "One of the things you can do to increase customer satisfaction is to use the student's name while you work with him/her."
- Include both positive and negative observations, giving positive ones first. Try to frame negative observations as areas for improvement rather than criticisms.
- Maintain a pleasant smile and/or direct eye contact with the staff member. Avoiding eye contact indicates discomfort, lying, and distress. Direct eye contact conveys confidence and sincerity.
- Maintain an open, somewhat informal posture; pay attention to body language, and send a nonverbal message of approachability.
- Beware of personal biases, attitudes, and hidden agendas. For example, the staff member's personal appearance (hair style, casual dress) may not be consistent with the evaluator's tastes, but may be perfectly fine for the position. It should not affect the evaluator's feedback on the position criteria.
- Be considerate of the receiver's feelings, readiness, trust level, tolerance limits, and self-esteem. Don't press on if emotions are strong. In difficult Evaluation discussions or when ratings need improvement, it may be necessary to stop the discussion and reschedule to clear the air and allow time for emotions to subside.

Performance Evaluation Process Steps (Unit 1)

Performance evaluations for Unit 1 staff members are a review of the employee's work performance and must be based upon criteria that are objective in nature.

NOTE: When the evaluation entails judgment about a physician's performance of assigned medical duties, such judgment shall be made by supervisory and managerial personnel who are licensed physicians.

A bargaining unit supervisor may prepare a written Evaluation as input to a staff member's Evaluation. This input should be submitted to the immediate HEERA designated administrator in the reporting line. Only HEERA designated administrators may sign Performance Evaluation forms as Evaluators.

Performance evaluations of all Unit 1 staff must be prepared on the official CSU, Fullerton form (Staff Performance Evaluation: Unit 1 – Physicians) that can be found on eForm.

The following are process steps in conducting evaluations

Step 1 Solicit input from the employee. Give the employee adequate time to prepare the input on the "Pre-Performance Evaluation Worksheet".

Step 2 Although not mandatory, it is recommended that the evaluator prepare a "draft" evaluation, and discusses it with appropriate administrator. Go to **Step 5**, if the evaluator decides not to prepare a "draft" evaluation.

Step 3 If the evaluator decides to prepare a "draft" evaluation, he/she should let the employee know that the purpose of the "draft" is to allow the employee an opportunity for review, input, and discussion. It is advisable that the evaluator give the employee a sufficient and specific time (i.e. up to 5 days) for the employee to review the "draft" evaluation and provide input, if any, to the evaluator.

Step 4 The evaluator considers the input provided by the employee in preparing the final performance evaluation.

Step 5 The evaluator discusses the final performance evaluation with the Appropriate Administrator, and, prior to discussing the evaluation with the employee, makes any necessary changes.

Step 6 The evaluator and the employee meet to discuss the evaluation.

Step 7 The employee, evaluator, and appropriate administrator sign the evaluation.

Step 8 The employee is given a signed copy of the evaluation.

Step 9 The signed evaluation is forwarded to Human Resources to be placed in the employee's official personnel file.

Performance Evaluation Process Steps (Units 2, 5, 7, & 9)

Performance evaluations for Units 2, 5, 7, and 9 staff members are a review of the employee's performance and should be based upon job-related criteria. The purpose of performance evaluation is to evaluate individual employee performance and provide guidance for performance development and improvement.

A bargaining unit supervisor may prepare a written Evaluation as input to a staff member's Evaluation. This input should be submitted to the immediate HEERA designated administrator in the reporting line. Only HEERA designated administrators may sign Performance Evaluation forms as Evaluators.

Performance evaluations of all Unit 2, 5, 7 & 9 staff must be prepared on the official CSU, Fullerton form (Staff Performance Evaluation: Unit 2, 5, 7, 9) that can be found on eForm.

<u>The following are process steps in conducting evaluations</u>

Step 1 Solicit input from the employee. Give the employee adequate time to prepare the input on the "Pre-Performance Evaluation Worksheet".

Step 2 The evaluator prepares the "draft" evaluation and discusses the "draft" with the appropriate administrator.

Step 3 The evaluator submits the "draft" evaluation to the employee for the employee's review, input, and discussion. The evaluator ensures that the employee knows that he/she have up to five (5) work days to review the "draft" evaluation, and to provide input, if any, to the evaluator.

Step 4 The evaluator considers the input provided by the employee in preparing the final performance evaluation.

Step 5 The evaluator discusses the final performance evaluation with the Appropriate Administrator, and, prior to discussing the evaluation with the employee, makes any necessary changes.

Step 6 The evaluator and the employee meet to discuss the evaluation.

Step 7 The employee, evaluator, and appropriate administrator sign the evaluation.

Step 8 The employee is given a signed copy of the evaluation.

Step 9 The signed evaluation is forwarded to Human Resources to be placed in the employee's official personnel file.

Performance Evaluation Process Steps (Unit 4)

Unit 4 employees must be evaluated utilizing the following criteria: Quality and quantity of the employee's work; professional judgment and responsibility; and specific contributions to the campus, CSU, or the community in areas directly related to the work assignment.

Performance evaluations must be based on the direct observation or supervision of the employee's work during the period since the employee's last performance evaluation. In the event the evaluator has not directly observed or supervised the employee's work, the evaluation must be based primarily on the content of the employee's official personnel file, including the applicable position description(s) and input from employees and/or students who have interacted with the employee. If the employee receives any rating of less than satisfactory (or its equivalent), the document(s) and/or specific example(s) relied upon for the rating must be given to the employee and placed in the employee's personnel file no later than the time at which the evaluation is given to the employee in draft form.

A bargaining unit supervisor may prepare a written Evaluation as input to a staff member's Evaluation. This input should be submitted to the immediate HEERA designated administrator in the reporting line. Only HEERA designated administrators may sign Performance Evaluation forms as Evaluators.

Performance evaluations of all Unit 4 staff must be prepared on the official CSU system wide form (Staff Performance Evaluation: Unit 4) that can be found on eForm.

The following are process steps in conducting evaluations

Step 1 The appropriate administrator must inform the employee in writing that a performance evaluation shall take place. At this point, input can be solicited from the employee. Give the employee an adequate, yet specific, time frame in which to prepare the input on the "Pre-Performance Evaluation Worksheet".

Step 2 The evaluator prepares the "draft" evaluation and discusses it with the Appropriate Administrator.

Step 3 The evaluator submits a "draft" evaluation to the employee for the employee's review, input, and discussion. The evaluator notifies the employee that he/she has up to fourteen (14) calendar days to review the "draft" evaluation, and provide input (rebuttal), if any, to the evaluator.

The employee may elect to submit such input (rebuttal) accompanied by the "draft" evaluation it rebuts to his/her personnel file. This step is also when the evaluator ensures that any documents referenced in the "draft" evaluation which are not part of the employee's official personnel file are submitted to the official personnel file.

Step 4 After the 14 days, the evaluator considers input (rebuttal) provided by the employee in preparing the final performance evaluation.

Step 5 The evaluator discusses the final performance evaluation with the Appropriate Administrator, and, prior to discussing the evaluation with the employee, makes any necessary changes.

Step 6 The evaluator and the employee meet to discuss the evaluation.

Step 7 The employee, evaluator, and appropriate administrator sign the evaluation.

Step 8 The employee is given a signed copy of the evaluation.

Step 9 The signed evaluation is forwarded to Human Resources to be placed in the employee's official personnel file.

Performance Evaluation Process Steps (Unit 6)

Performance evaluations for Unit 6 staff members are for the purpose of evaluating individual employee performance and for providing guidance for performance development and improvements, and are based upon job-related criteria.

Evaluators can not be in the bargaining unit. However, the evaluation may be based on input from the employee and the employee's bargaining unit supervisor, if appropriate.

Performance evaluations of all Unit 6 staff must be prepared on the official CSU, Fullerton form (Staff Performance Evaluation: Unit 6 – Skilled Crafts) that can be found on eForm.

<u>The following are process steps in conducting evaluations</u>:

Step 1 Solicit input from the employee. Give the employee adequate time to prepare the input on the "Pre-Performance Evaluation Worksheet".

Step 2 Although not mandatory, it is recommended that the evaluator prepare a "draft" evaluation, and discusses it with appropriate administrator. Go to **Step 5**, if the evaluator decides not to prepare a "draft" evaluation.

Step 3 If the evaluator decides to submit a "draft" evaluation to the employee, he/she should let the employee know that the purpose of the "draft" is to allow the employee an opportunity for review, input, and discussion. It is advisable that the evaluator give the employee a sufficient, but a specific time (i.e. up to five (5) days) to review the "draft" evaluation and provide input, if any, to the evaluator.

Step 4 The evaluator considers the input provided by the employee in preparing the final performance evaluation.

Step 5 The evaluator discusses the final performance evaluation with the Appropriate Administrator, and, prior to discussing the evaluation with the employee, makes any necessary changes.

Step 6 The evaluator and the employee must meet to discuss the evaluation

Step 7 The employee, evaluator, and appropriate administrator sign the evaluation.

Step 8 The employee is given a signed copy of the evaluation.

Step 9 The signed evaluation is forwarded to Human Resources to be placed in the employee's official personnel file.

Performance Evaluation Process Steps (Unit 8)

Performance evaluations for Unit 8 staff are for the purpose of evaluating individual employee performance and for providing guidance for performance development and improvements, and are based upon job-related criteria.

A sergeant or the immediate supervisor may prepare a draft and sign the performance evaluation. A sworn MPP employee reviews the evaluation as the approving authority prior to presenting it to the employee. At the completion of the evaluation discussions with the employee, the sworn MPP shall sign the evaluation. If the sworn MPP is the immediate supervisor, then a non-sworn MPP reviews and signs the performance evaluation.

Performance evaluations of all Unit 8 staff employees must be prepared on the official CSU, Fullerton form (Staff Performance Evaluation: Unit 8 – Public Safety) that can be found in eForms.

The following are process steps in conducting evaluations:

Step 1. Solicit input from the employee. Give the employee adequate time to prepare the input on the "Pre-Performance Evaluation Worksheet".

Step 2. Although not mandatory, it is recommended that the evaluator prepare a "draft" evaluation, and discusses it with appropriate administrator. Go to **Step 5**, if the evaluator decides not to prepare a "draft" evaluation.

Step 3. If the evaluator decides to submit a "draft" evaluation to the employee, he/she should let the employee know that the purpose of the "draft" is to allow the employee an opportunity for review, input, and discussion. It is advisable that the evaluator give the employee a sufficient and specific time (i.e. up to five (5) days) to review the "draft" evaluation and provide input, if any, to the evaluator.

Step 4. The evaluator considers the input provided by the employee in preparing the final performance evaluation.

Step 5. The evaluator discusses the final performance evaluation with the Appropriate Administrator, and, prior to discussing the evaluation with the employee, makes any necessary changes.

Step 6. The evaluator and the employee must meet to discuss the evaluation.

Step 7. The employee, evaluator, and appropriate administrator sign the evaluation.

Step 8. The employee is given a signed copy of the evaluation.

Step 9. The signed evaluation is forwarded to Human Resources to be placed in the employee's official personnel file.

TIPS FOR SETTING GOALS

Goals should be linked to the performance criteria, the department/division goals, and the overall University goals. Staff members are better able to achieve top performance when organizational planning, goal setting, and assessment begin at the highest levels of the organization and permeate through divisional/departmental goals to become individual goals. In this way, every individual's performance is linked to the organization's plans and successes.

The number of goals established should be realistic for the period covered and should be part of regular progress discussions during the upcoming review period. *SMART* goals follow the *SMART* format. They are:

Specific
Measurable
Aggressive yet Achievable
Relevant
Time-bound

For each performance criterion, outcomes and results can be determined and measured. For example:

Criteria	Possible Outcome
Quality	Reduced number of errors
Volume of Work	Increased number of documents processed
Oral Communication	Reduction in the number of times people request clarification of process
Interpersonal Skills	Increased student satisfaction ratings
Initiative	Increased number of new projects/ ideas generated

The first step in developing an outcome-focused goal is to describe the desired results as illustrated in the example above. These outcome-focused goals should then be further defined by specifically indicating the measurements that will be utilized. These measurements should address areas such as time, speed, quality, or quantity. For example, "reduced" or "increased" by how much? Over what time period will this reduction or increase occur? Additionally, how will success be determined? What evidence will be utilized to demonstrate achievement?

Each of these outcomes should be further defined following the *SMART* model discussed previously. Focusing on outcomes and ensuring that goals are *S*pecific, *M*easurable, *A*ggressive yet *A*chievable, *R*elevant, and *T*ime-bound increases the likelihood that the desired level of performance will be achieved.

In summary

Ongoing communication, coaching, and immediate feedback throughout the year help to set the stage for a successful Performance Evaluation discussion. As previously mentioned, prior to developing the actual Performance Evaluation, the evaluator should ensure the staff member has the opportunity to provide input, ideas, goals, and evidence related to performance.

At no time should a Performance Evaluation, draft or otherwise, be shared with a staff member before the next levels of management have reviewed the Evaluation. Until appropriate review, feedback, and/or approvals have been received; the Performance Evaluation is a confidential draft document and should be treated as such.

Please contact your division HR Coordinator should you have any questions regarding the process.

NOTE: *In case of conflicts with materials covered concerning requirements of specific collective bargaining agreements, the actual labor contract prevails.*